DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 056 291 AC 012 047

AUTHOR Coghill, Mary Ann
TITLE Games and Simulations in Industrial and Labor Relations Training.
INSTITUTION State Univ. of New York, Ithaca. School of Industrial and Labor Relations at Cornell Univ.
PUB DATE Sep 71
NOTE 29p.; Key Issues Series-No. 7

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS *Administrative Personnel; Bibliographies; *Educational Games; *Human Relations; Industry; *Management Games; *Simulation; Workshops

ABSTRACT

This book is not designed to be read like a book; instead, it is intended for group participation. Games and simulations are a popular development in industrial and labor relations training programs. This report brings to the attention of instructors, in both the business and academic communities, the variety of subjects and levels at which such exercises are focused. The book is divided into five sections: Games and Simulation Techniques, Workshop, Collective Bargaining Games and Simulations, Supervisory Training Programs, and List of References. (CK)

ED056291

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

games and simulations in industrial and labor relations training

MARY ANN COGHILL

KEY ISSUES: background reports on current topics and trends in labor-management relations - NUMBER 7

AC 012 041

KEY ISSUES, a series of reports designed to give background information on current problems of general concern to leaders in management, labor, government, education, and public service. Each report is based primarily on research publications, legislative documents, conference proceedings, and other materials available in the School's Martin P. Catherwood Library.

The following reports have appeared to date:

1. *Sensitivity Training* by Mary Ann Coghill, 1968, 28 pages.

2. *The Lie Detector in Employment* by Mary Ann Coghill, 1968, 28 pages.

3. *Job Satisfaction* by Bonnie Carroll, 1969, 40 pages.

4. *Portable Pensions* by Jozetta H. Srb, 1969, 40 pages.

5. *Coalition Bargaining* by Phillip J. Schwarz, 1970, 44 pages.

6. *Employment Testing and Minority Groups* by Doris B. Rosen, 1970, 36 pages.

7. *Games and Simulations in Industrial & Labor Relations Training* by Mary Ann Coghill, 1971, 32 pages.

The following report will be available in December 1971:

8. *Communicating with Employees about Benefits* by Jozetta H. Srb discusses problems in communicating employee benefit programs, particularly welfare and pension plans. Includes recent proposals for benefit communication standards.

Each report is $2.00 a copy and checks should be made payable to the N.Y.S. School of Industrial and Labor Relations. Orders for individual reports or standing orders for the series may be sent to:

Publications Division
New York State School of Industrial and Labor Relations
Cornell University
Ithaca, New York 14850

Series Editor: Jozetta H. Srb

KEY ISSUES SERIES - NO. 7

GAMES AND SIMULATIONS IN INDUSTRIAL AND LABOR RELATIONS TRAINING

by

Mary Ann Coghill

September 1971

New York State School of Industrial
and Labor Relations, Cornell University,
Ithaca, New York

TABLE OF CONTENTS

GAMES AND SIMULATION TECHNIQUES 1

WORKSHOP 4

COLLECTIVE BARGAINING GAMES AND SIMULATIONS 8

- BNA's Collective Bargaining Game 8
- IRC's Collective Bargaining Game 11
- Collective Bargaining 12
- Contract Negotiations 14
- Settle or Strike 17

SUPERVISORY TRAINING PROGRAMS 19

- Handling Conflict in Management 20
- The Supervisors' Workshop 21

LIST OF REFERENCES 22

- Labor Relations Games and Simulations 22
- Catalogs and Game Lists 23
- Background and Theory 24
- Business Games "Giants" 25

GAMES AND SIMULATION TECHNIQUES

Games and simulations are a popular development in industrial and labor relations training programs. This report brings to the attention of instructors, in both the business and academic communities, the variety of subjects and levels at which such exercises are focused.

Since the simulation of the astronauts' moon walk was televised to the American public, there is little difficulty in understanding that a simulation allows a person to walk through an operating model of the environment which he expects to enter later in the flesh. The simulation can be more or less "real," simple or complex and detailed; its time span can cover a few seconds or several years or cycles; and it can model not only physical environments but also, as is the case with most simulations reported here, social environments or systems.

Games as a training or preparation-for-life method, however, have not received the dramatic public exposure of the simulation technique. Their proponents are still qualifying them as games for learning, teaching games, educational games, didactic games, programmed learning games, and games with simulated environments. A game denotes a contest with stated rules and "game" is appropriately applied to simulations of a competitive nature. In interacting games, the decision of one team influences the results of the other team or teams. But even in non-interacting games when the action of a team has no effect on any others, the competitive aspect is still present through comparison of results.

Educators, especially those in business and management fields where this teaching technique is well-developed, point out that its greatest advantage over more traditional training techniques is its dynamic quality. It generates a sustained, high-level of involvement. They call a business game a "living case." Trainees are actively involved in making decisions which have real consequences in the immediate environment. Time and events are telescoped so that many more experiences are possible than in normal teaching periods or in on-the-job training programs. Without the risk of real-life consequences, the participant is encouraged to experiment with new strategies. This leads some educators to say that a game is an "environment for self-instruction," rather than a device for teaching.

Business school faculty at Carnegie Tech, Harvard, and the University of Chicago have thoroughly documented their experiences with the development, design, and various uses of their management games. For a greater understanding of the potential of gaming for management development, the reader is referred to the three books listed as business game "giants" in the bibliography of this report. Although these authors are discussing business games and very complex ones, their advice on planning, administration, and critique sessions is applicable to even simple simulations on any subject.

The single most crucial task facing the game administrator, say the Chicago authors, is to determine as specifically as possible the purpose of running the simulation. Then it is relatively easy to make the necessary decisions in management and evaluation. The good game

administrator must have some of the qualities of an entrepreneur; in many respects, they say, he may well be likened to the producer of a play. Issues of practical detail may spell the difference between failure and success in game use, and administrators' manuals are needed as well as players'.

The critique or debriefing session provides an opportunity for all participants to share or compare ideas, techniques, and reactions. To the extent that the critique is looked on merely as a chance to participate in a bull session about the play, the experts say the effectiveness of the entire effort is in jeopardy. It is the administrator's responsibility to direct attention to the most critical and meaningful portions of the play. The focal point of the critique discussions of the earliest American Management Association game, and one which serves a worthy aim today, was: "Were we to relive this experience, in what way would our actions be different?"

* * * *

Eight industrial and labor relations games and simulations are described in this report. One of them is aimed at the general functions of management, while five of the exercises concentrate on the special function of collective bargaining, and two deal specifically with the human relations aspect of supervision.

WORKSHOP is similar in most respects to the general management games, with their problems of policy making and allocation of funds which have been used successfully in business education for a number of years. It is included in this review because its organizational setting - sheltered workshops and rehabilitation facilities - is of particular interest to manpower and personnel specialists. Although the current version is not computerized, it could easily be adapted.

WORKSHOP is a complex game in which one team of players is pitted against a model of the world. In contrast, all of the collective bargaining games pit one team of players against another. Ten years ago, Wendell French, observing an early bargaining simulation, suggested that in a college course it might be dovetailed into a broader, management-decision game with the results of the bargaining in an industrial relations class being incorporated into the gaming in a policy course. But, while business games developed historically from chess, war games, and operations research, training in the collective bargaining field has traditionally been in the form of role play and mock negotiation, perhaps because of its relationship to legal education and the practice of moot court.

The five bargaining exercises illustrate several ways of injecting realism into bargaining education. The BNA Game stresses the sophistication of the problem-case. Contract Negotiations, Settle or Strike, and Collective Bargaining have an emphasis on the role profiles which they supply for both the individual players and the teams as a whole. Only two of the games are scored; both pit union teams against other union teams, and management teams

against other management teams for scoring purposes. Point values of a settlement in IRC's Game vary according to relative worth to a team, while in Collective Bargaining, union scores are in units of satisfaction and management measures in dollars.

The two simulations of human relations are quite different in their designs. Handling Conflict scores each personal and group decision, using this scheme primarily as a stimulus for discussion. The Supervisors' Workshop uses physical stage props to aid in simulating the physiological and psychological disorientation of the hard-core unemployed.

It seems appropriate to include at this point an important note from gamemaker Erwin Rausch:

> Simulations and learning games are designed to be group participation activities, and are definitely not designed to be read like a book.
>
> It has been our experience that even highly sophisticated trainers and educators rarely appreciate the full impact of the technique when they read a game rather than play it in a group. We have learned that a clear view of the process comes only from observation of, or participation in the game situation.
>
> As a matter of fact, individual reading of a game – as contrasted to playing it – tends to obscure the effect. Sometimes it can actually be misleading since the technique, is a group activity.

WORKSHOP

WORKSHOP, a training program for management personnel of rehabilitation workshops, simulates the operations of a moderate-size facility with formidable growing pains. The fictional Allen County Workshop, like the more than a thousand rehabilitation workshops across the country, accepts clients whose physical, mental, or cultural disabilities affect them vocationally, and gives them training and counseling aimed to place them in competitive employment.

Recognizing that a sheltered workshop is a social agency and at the same time an organization with an industrial program involving business management, William J. Wasmuth and his associates in the Rehabilitation Research and Training Projects at the New York School of Industrial and Labor Relations developed the simulation WORKSHOP to emphasize the interplay of the rehabilitation and administration components. They held the first WORKSHOP program in December 1967.

To achieve the high credibility necessary to involve key personnel in such an exercise, Wasmuth's staff based the simulation on data of real-world organizational, financial, staffing, and client situations which they had gathered through questionnaires and field studies of 123 shops. (This research, directed by William H. Button, was sponsored by the Region II Office of the Rehabilitation Services Administration of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.) They used data from this survey to establish the rules, and the probabilities of various outcomes, thus assuring much greater reality in the training than if these factors were arbitrarily determined.

From a history of the Allen County Workshop outlined in the 38-page player's manual, WORKSHOP participants learn that the number of clients has risen from 15 to 56; the deficit, however, has mounted from $5,000 to $37,000; and there have been questions about an insufficient range of services. The board of directors has discharged the executive director, not because of inadequate skills as a rehabilitator or as a fund raiser, but as their letter stated, "because of his inability to grasp the fundamental importance of adopting an overall strategy of workshop administration." Teams of five players take over the management at this point and grapple with its problems for five days representing a simulated year of operation.

Each team must decide which member will assume the role of the new executive director and key staff positions, or they may choose to operate as a task force or an executive committee. The group must also formulate a statement of objectives and strategy; for example, self-support, deficit financing, maintenance of rehabilitation services, or expansion.

The WORKSHOP staff must respond to a variety of situations presented to them in twelve monthly packets, each requiring two or three hours to complete and dealing with seven critical decision variables:

- admissions
- subcontracting
- placement
- staffing
- financing and development of cost data
- community relations
- relations with board of directors

A playing board is used as a visual aid and shows at a glance the areas of the workshop's program and the flow of clients as they move from the evaluation and training stage through a production period to scheduled placement. Clients in the workshop are designated short-term clients requiring four months to complete their evaluation and training period, or long-term clients, requiring six months. Long-term clients can eventually enter the "Lower Potential Earning" production area while short-term clients enter the "Higher Potential Earning" area, these terms referring to their earning potential for the workshop.

Facing the WORKSHOP staff each month are the following types of decisions:

1. To accept or reject each client referred for admission after reviewing the information presented in "real-life" case records.

2. To accept or reject each subcontract offer, taking into account its potential revenue for the shop and the training value to the clients.

3. To increase or decrease the production and professional staffs - based on the prior decisions about clients and subcontracts.

4. How to respond to various items in the "in basket," such as a telegram of complaint from a state senator, a request for a raise from a junior production supervisor, or an invitation to speak at a community event. Some situations call for role playing, for example, when the director must respond to a visit from a board member or from the vocational rehabilitation counselor.

Each team communicates its decisions in writing to a coordinator who, representing the outside environment, responds with the help of a 30-page umpire's manual and a packet of "in-basket" decision materials; for example:

> If they misclassify too many clients, he sends a warning and eventually removes a number of clients to alternate facilities, and initiates a role-play situation between the team and a counselor from the Department of Vocational Rehabilitation to develop better classification criteria.

If they fail to maintain a minimum ratio of supervisors to production clients, he sends them a memo cancelling a subcontract due to poor quality work.

When the team fails to respond to various community requests, he can drop subcontract offers because "word has gotten around town that the WORKSHOP staff is uncooperative."

Coordinators are usually experienced workshop personnel whose role can range from one of questioning or needling a team which is unclear or sloppy in its approach to explaining and supporting a team which is having difficulty grasping a concept or understanding vital information.

The consequences of a particular simulated decision are sometimes delayed, just as they are in real life. But hour by hour, the coordinators take back to the teams evidence of the effects of their actions. This constant feedback culminates in a general evaluation session on the final day when teams and individuals are asked to look back on the experience as a whole, and to think through the rationale of the simulation, their strategy, and the various responses to it.

The content of the evaluation session depends to a great extent on what each team has prepared in its annual report. Spokesmen for each group are given a maximum of twenty-five minutes to present a summary of the simulation experience. In addition, the coordinator attempts to structure feedback in three major areas:

1. A review of significant changes in the team's initial objectives and strategy as established during the first month and the sixth month; also a review of any changes in team organization from one quarter to another.

2. A review of policies and relationships established and "discovered" for each of the seven major variables. For example, in the area of admissions, questions should be asked about how teams set client admission and rejection criteria and how important the admission decision was felt to be as a variable affecting overall workshop organization.

3. A discussion of the merits of viewing the workshop as a "system" in attempting to cope with the problems of organizational change and growth. Audio-visual aids are available for this purpose.

There is no win or lose in this program. Teams do not compete against each other; rather, each WORKSHOP staff struggles against the model of the outside environment applied by the coordinator and against the inside environment they create for themselves.

Each team is rated on its consistency in relating sound strategy to its defined objectives during the ups and downs of various business cycles. When the teams begin, the workshop

has a tremendous deficit. The simulation then moves through a break-even period, through to a period of expansion and innovation, and ultimately into hardship or recession. Teams are not expected to eliminate the deficit, but they are required to show progress in reducing it as well as understanding specific revenue and cost trends.

Conflict situations develop, resources become scarce, opportunities present themselves, trade-offs between two or more factors are required, stringent time demands are made, analysis is necessary, and a strategy hammered out within a team framework must be implemented. Such problem encounters are part of the dynamics which permit team members, in hours, to live out the experience of a month in the management of the workshop. As the game progresses, most groups become intensely involved and see the setting as "their" workshop rather than a fictional organization in Allen County.

As an outgrowth of the recognized need for this type of program, Wasmuth's staff has developed a modification of WORKSHOP, called DIRECTION, for members of the boards of directors of rehabilitation facilities and sheltered workshops. While retaining certain features of the initial program, DIRECTION places each participant in the position of a board member of the Allen County Workshop and focuses on development of new funding sources, integration of community services, and managerial planning to cope with organizational growth and change.

Similar to WORKSHOP is a simulation for health care administrators called CRISIS, which Wasmuth designed initially for use with senior students in the Administration of Health Services Program at Ithaca College and has since extended to use with hospital staffs. CRISIS places each participant in a small decision-making group as a key staff member of a hospital rehabilitation facility, and the case history of Urban Community Hospital subsequently involves all participants in one "crisis" after another. CRISIS was developed primarily to enable individuals in managerial, supervisory, or administrative positions, or in training for them, to apply strategies of their own design, to set goals, and solve a variety of administrative and health care problems.

Reference: William J. Wasmuth, "WORKSHOP; A Dynamic Simulated Training Program," Rehabilitation Record: July-August 1970, pp. 12-16.

COLLECTIVE BARGAINING GAMES AND SIMULATIONS

BNA's Collective Bargaining Game

BNA's Collective Bargaining Game was developed by the Bureau of National Affairs, Inc., publishers of information services, for its business and labor clients. Although the game manual describes the relationship of a fictional company and union, the case materials are composites drawn from a number of actual situations, lending a great deal of authenticity to the game.

The game was introduced as a part of BNA's annual Briefing Sessions on Collective Bargaining in 1959. Participants were "real-life" management and union officials, representing many diverse backgrounds in type of organization and bargaining strategy. The primary purpose of the game for this group was to provide an opportunity for sharing advice and experience. Professor Wendell French, describing one of these sessions, found it interesting that when the participants were asked to divide into teams, a number of company officials wanted to be on a union team while union officers preferred a management team. He said, "They apparently wanted to gain perspective on bargaining approaches of the other side."

One of the basic problems presented to negotiators was a company desire to modify a contract clause which restricted management's right to modernize the plant. Every management group in the game set itself the task of eliminating or modifying that clause on the best terms it could get. But, French reported, participants who thought they had achieved a signal victory in their solutions were ruefully forced to concede they hadn't considered all the ramifications of the contract terms they had agreed to. Aside from the actual "experience" which such games can give participants, French felt that the principal benefits came from the frank and full discussion of the settlements in a round-table evaluation session following the negotiations. He was pleased to find "real-life" union negotiators giving frank and candid advice to "real-life" management negotiators (and vice versa) about the future implications of their settlements.

BNA president John D. Stewart who developed "The Case of Burns & Bruce" in 1959 has given permission for its use in a number of universities. For the past several years, Professor Donald E. Cullen has been making the exercise a regular part of his collective bargaining course at the New York State School of Industrial and Labor Relations. He has altered the original case in certain respects (the industry and locale) but his principal effort has been to update its economic data from 1958 to 1966 figures.

The game depends on calculation of the cost of the wage and fringe items to the company and this can take considerable time. Cullen cancels three regular class periods and assignments to allow the students in teams of four to hold organizational meetings and prepare for the negotiating session. He requires each team to bring to this session a completed form describing its bargaining goals with respect to six items:

1.	Across-the-board wages	_____ cents per hour
2.	Wages for skilled workers	_____ cents per hour
3.	Vacations	_____ cents per hour
4.	Total economic package	_____ cents per hour
5.	Union shop clause	_____ yes, no, or modification
6.	Management rights clause	_____ yes, no, or modification

The team must first indicate its target point on each item:

For the union, the most it reasonably hopes to win in these negotiations without calling a strike;

For the company, the least it hopes to settle for without taking a strike.

Then the team must indicate its resistance point on each item:

The least the union will accept, below which it would strike;

The most the company will offer, beyond which it will take a strike.

These goals do not bind a team in the actual negotiations; that is, a union team is free to settle for less than its minimum or a company for more than its maximum. But the assignment is to make the anticipated limits as realistic as possible.

The final negotiating session is usually scheduled in the evening. There are four hours until the strike deadline. Two thirty-minute extensions are permitted by mutual agreement. Either team may declare a recess at any time for caucusing. The company president shall have final authority within each management team to accept or reject any proposed settlement. Within union teams, however, majority rule shall prevail in all major decisions. At the conclusion of bargaining, the president of each team must hand in a form describing the final agreement—or, if no agreement, his team's final proposal.

The students can easily compare their bargaining goals and the final terms of any agreement on a point for point basis, and evaluate their own performance. Although Professor Cullen makes no attempt to assign grades for this exercise, he finds that the interest and enthusiasm generated by the realism and sophistication of the problem insure participation without such an incentive as grades. An illustration of this occurred last year.

An entire union team was seen walking out the door of where the sessions were being held. They accused the management team of cheating and found this intolerable in view of their own sincerity and good faith in bargaining. All negotiators had received identical packets of material containing the basic facts of the case, but each side had also received a set of confidential correspondence and inter-office memos. When this particular union team returned to the bargaining table after a caucus, a member of the management team quoted information to them which could have been obtained only by stealing a confidential union memo, or at least stealing a look at it. That the union negotiators were so outraged by this behavior was surprising because similar action is included in the confidential game materials themselves. The instructor undertook the unexpected task of mediator and was successful in bringing the parties back to the bargaining table.

Reference: Wendell L. French, "A Collective Bargaining Game; Simulation Technique in Industrial Relations from BNA," Journal of the American Society of Training Directors: January 1961; reprinted in Robert G. Graham & Clifford F. Gray, Business Games Handbook New York: American Management Assoc., 1969 pp. 113-118.

IRC's Collective Bargaining Game

Industrial Relations Counselors, Inc., has used a collective bargaining game to familiarize personnel and industrial relations specialists with bargaining issues and pressures faced by company representatives during actual negotiations with labor leaders. Played at IRC's Management Course in Industrial Relations at Williamsburg, Va., this "Williamsburg Game" requires participants to divide into union and management teams and negotiate a contract.

The bargaining issues include: a wage increase, hours and overtime, retirement, severance pay, supplementary unemployment benefits, subcontracting, and management rights. The private briefing information for each team contains the score values indicating the relative worth to the team of the various settlement possibilities for each bargaining issue. These score values constitute the primary yardstick against which negotiating performance will be measured.

The teams receive a statement of their respective "outlooks" on each issue and an enumeration of the possible settlement listed in the order of their desirability for the team and, consequently, in the order of their positive to negative point values. On some issues, a team scores zero points for maintaining the present position; on others, it actually accumulates points for maintaining the status quo. Although the settlement possibilities are usually in reverse order in terms of their desirability for the two teams, the point values are not necessarily directly equivalent. For example, it might be worth a large number of points for management to hold its own on a given issue, but not an equally big loss to the union if it does not gain on this issue - and the point system realistically takes this into account.

Just as real negotiations are not conducted in a vacuum, neither is the game. As soon as one company and union settle an issue, the scoring system changes and reflects the increased importance of doing as well as they have. The first team to settle an issue receives the number of points indicated in the initial-expectation column; in subsequent settlements of that issue, other teams must reach a comparable level to obtain the same number of points. When a team accepts a settlement at a less desirable level (lower on the list of possible settlements) than the first team, the score points are read from a revised column of lesser awards. To check on the comparative progress of its competitors, a team may delegate a scout to contact them periodically and report back on their status and strategies.

The game rules specify a total negotiating time of 60 minutes, although caucuses may be called at any time. Each minute equals one day. The contract expires thirty days after the start of negotiations. Temporary extensions of the contract, up to fourteen days, are more costly in penalty points per day to the union than to management. The strike called if the contract expires is more costly per day to the company. The penalty for non-settlement at the end of the negotiating time limit is equally severe for both teams.

Collective Bargaining

Collective Bargaining by Erwin Rausch is designed primarily for foremen, supervisors, and managers who influence relations with union members, but who are normally not involved in the collective bargaining process. It dramatizes the political and economic forces at work and it stresses the need for careful wording of new clauses.

Participants confront each other in teams of union and management representatives to try to obtain a satisfactory contract. The objective for each management team is to obtain, at the lowest possible cost to its company, a better contract than other management teams; and for each union team to obtain better benefits in the settlement than other union teams.

The game can be played in two to three hours, by any number of groups of six persons. All players begin as members of a management group grappling with two difficult grievance problems (overtime and subcontracting). Then the group divides into two teams, with four persons representing the union and two speaking for management. In these roles, the teams negotiate one or two contract clauses and settle the wages and benefits issues (holidays, vacations, pensions, insurance). Time limits of five, ten, and fifteen-minute intervals are set for the negotiating periods, and every minute of delay is penalized as a work stoppage or strike.

After the final settlement and the new contract is in effect, the players are given short descriptions of six possible situations that can occur in the next few months. In each case the teams must decide whether the situation would result in a grievance, whether the new contract clauses cover the situation, and whether or not the union has a strong case.

This game brings out an important factor - each man at the bargaining table has his own personal view of each issue and he brings his own set of values to the deliberation - and it influences the course of the negotiations, for example:

> The chief steward is married, his wife is employed, and they have no children. He has ten years' service. Holidays and vacation benefits interest him, and an increase in pension is more important than straight cash.
>
> One steward has a wife and three children to support and is badly in need of cash. Since employees cannot receive payment instead of vacation time, he is not interested in increased time off.
>
> Another steward is a young man who prefers additional time off rather than more money. Strikes are less of a threat to him than to the others.
>
> The business agent is anxious to obtain a wage settlement in excess of a specific goal, but for him, a strike is a last resort. His union superiors expect him to make progress toward such long range union goals as improved pensions.

The two management men also see things differently: Since it has been company practice to grant salaried employees the same additions to vacations, holidays, and insurance protection as are given to union members, the industrial relations manager feels that this additional cost must be counted when the cost of a settlement is computed. The plant manager feels improved benefits are necessary to meet local competition and, rather than a costly practice, he sees it as a matter of administrative convenience to him to have the benefits identical.

These viewpoints are built into the game. Players must accept the assumption that the preferences of people can be measured and expressed in numerical terms. The company representatives measure the cost of the settlement in dollars, while union members measure their gains in hypothetical units of satisfaction. How else, Rausch asks, could the value of another day of leisure be measured?

When players have chosen their roles on the union and management teams, they study the "Factsheet" to guide their actions in the negotiating sessions. The "Factsheet" shows the units of gain assigned to each negotiator for each of the various benefits.

For example, for the steward who is hard-pressed for cash, each cent-per-hour increase equals more units of gain than for the other negotiators. For the chief steward, each additional vacation day after ten years' service equals more gain than for his teammates. On each additional cent of pension benefit, the chief steward and the business agent receive the same number of points because their pension goals are similar. Vacation, holiday, and insurance increases cost more dollar-points to the corporate industrial relations manager than to the local plant manager, reflecting their differing viewpoints. Both teams lose points for stoppages and strikes, but these are scaled according to value to the individual player.

The net gains or costs of each team member are added together to get the team totals. Also figured in the scores are team points gained in negotiating the overtime and subcontracting clauses and in testing their application to the future situations posed. The final scoring compares only union teams with other union teams, and management teams only with other management teams.

Rausch, who is president of Didactic Systems, Inc., has designed many of what he calls "didactic simulation/games" for supervisory and management training. A common characteristic of his games which he points to is that they are participative exercises in the form of small booklets providing a series of short cases, pertinent to the training objective. They require trainees to make personal decisions in each of the cases and, after they have committed themselves, they must reconcile their different viewpoints to arrive at a group consensus. Relevance is one of the advantages of these games; Rausch says they can be designed for very specific objectives and can cover them quite thoroughly. Economy of operation is another advantage because a single trainer can work effectively with as many as ten or twelve groups of five members each, without any sacrifice of quality. Most of the critique is part of the exercise itself and does not need a trainer.

Contract Negotiations

Contract Negotiations is a simulation in which a company and a union are attempting to negotiate their second contract. It was designed by Northeastern University Professors Jay J. Zif and Robert E. Otlewski to provide practical experience for students in collective bargaining, industrial relations, and personnel courses.

From the "Scenario" and "Analysis of Labor Relations" included in the 55-page Player's Manual, the student learns that the first contract had been loosely written and a number of changes are necessary in key contract clauses, as shown by the number of grievance and arbitration cases that have arisen. The union has as its primary goals the attainment of union and individual security as well as increased fringe benefits. The company, a producer of wood household furniture, feels it must engage in subcontracting and automation in order to remain competitive.

In the course of the simulation the student becomes familiar with the other materials and tools included in the manual, such as: a copy of the previous contract, a list of issues brought up in the previous negotiation but dropped, grievance and arbitration cases of the last contract period, wage data, and company accounting records.

Each student becomes a member of a union or management team, with a specific role to play on that team. Five role profiles have been created for each team. They outline the issues which would concern a person in each of these positions, and are not intended to force attitudes on the player, but rather to allow his own personality to take over. Briefly described, here are the roles to be assigned or chosen by the students.

The management negotiators:

Vice President of Industrial Relations. While this officer must be prepared to deal with all of the major bargaining issues, his sensitivity to worker as well as management demands should enable him to formulate a fair compromise on most issues.

Vice President of Production. Consideration of production costs will be foremost in his handling of the issues, and his major concern is the possibility of a costly strike over subcontracting.

The Comptroller. His specific responsibility for these negotiations is the best approach to a new wage and fringe package.

Administrative Assistant for Wage & Salary Administration. He will be concerned with all issues related to the wage program and will consider worker satisfaction as well as company cost.

Grievance Supervisor. His primary concern will be to promote faster settling of grievances at a low administrative level, to cut down the number of cases going into arbitration, and to solve the problem of union stewards spending too much company time on union duties.

The union negotiators:

Local Union President. He organized the union over the issue of seniority rights in a layoff and now wants to extend them to other issues.

Local Union Vice President. He will side with younger workers and will consider issues for their long-term company viability. He is the team's labor law expert.

Local Union Secretary-Treasurer. His responsibility is to present a financial analysis of wage-fringe packages and also to determine whether the union could provide enough strike benefits to make a strike feasible.

International Union Representative. He must dissociate himself from the local conflict and try to reconcile the workers' welfare with the viability of the company in the industry.

Chairman of the Grievance Committee. He must consider whether any issues under discussion will give cause for further grievances and he must try to insure that everything in the new contract is as clearly defined as possible.

The simulation is designed to be played in six sessions. If all are held during class time, it takes eight hours or more; otherwise, a minimum of three hours is necessary but four to five hours allow optimum play.

The first session will be organizational. Then, the authors recommend that the teams prepare their materials and hold their first team meetings outside of class.

At the opening bargaining session, teams present their initial demands to opponents with brief verbal arguments for support. Strategy meetings where teams meet to react to their opponent's initial presentation may take place outside of class.

The bargaining sessions follow; allowing for caucus meetings, this can take from one to three hours. The instructor controls the length of negotiations by limiting the number of demands each team may make. The authors suggest that the wage package be treated as one demand, and estimate that six demands by each side can be adequately handled by the students in three hours of bargaining. The instructor sets the contract termination time. The parties cannot extend the contract; there is either a new contract or a strike at the deadline.

The final session is a review and critique session with all of the participants. The instructor should provide feedback to them on their strategy, focussing on the trade-offs and compromises as well as their general conduct during the negotiations. If video tape equipment is available, the authors suggest that one or more negotiations be taped for playback and subsequent analysis by the class.

In the "Instructor's Guide," Professors Zif and Otlewski discuss their development of Contract Negotiations. They chose to simulate the most common subject for negotiation, the renewal and revision of an existing contract, because it provides a structure for the bargaining and avoids the greater complication of negotiating a first contract which would require advanced knowledge on the part of the students.

They included role profiles because by allowing the student to identify with a specific member of the negotiating team, he can define a manageable approach to the background materials and at the negotiating table he becomes acquainted with a relatively strong portrayal of all positions.

In writing their scenario, the authors chose an industry where rising costs cannot be fully passed on to the customer, thereby giving the management team an incentive to hold the line on wages. Subcontracting and automation are current trends, giving the union team a concern with job security. They chose a rapidly expanding firm with the personnel problems typical of this situation.

These instructors have constructed an exercise for the student to experience all stages of the collective bargaining process—preparation, initial meeting, and actual bargaining—so that he can see the relevance and use of the concepts and tools presented in his regular lectures. He can quickly sense his own mastery of the material as he carries out his role; the team effort will minimize individual weaknesses and prevent frustration while it immediately reinforces proper application of the theory to the situation. The authors label it a "test situation of a corrective nature" and feel that the students should have reasonable competence in the application of the principles of collective bargaining when the simulation is over.

Professor Zif, president of Creative Studies, Inc., has co-authored three other Creative Studies Simulations: Managing the Worker, The Personnel Department, and Reorganization.

Settle or Strike

Settle or Strike was designed for the Communications Workers of America's School for Local Negotiators to allow CWA members engaged in new units to gain a better idea of the problems faced in the collective bargaining process. The game, according to the 26-page instructor's manual, is not intended to "teach bargaining," but to engage the player in the strategies employed during bargaining and in securing the kinds of information required to present effective arguments to the opposing team. Thus, strategy and substantive information requirements are the main focus of the game.

The game kit includes a vinyl game board showing the bargaining issues, display mechanisms to indicate positions on issues, an Agreement Result Calculator, player's data files, workbook, and identification buttons.

Each player is given the "Rapids Junction Scenario" with information on the town, the company, the union, and the local labor market situation. His "Data File" contains factual information on company costs and profits, wage and fringe benefits comparisons, employee information, and recent problems in the shop.

The players on the union side of the bargaining table are the Local 0001 president, the Lastik Plastik Company unit chairman, and the CWA staff representative. On the company side of the table, there is the company lawyer-accountant, company president, and the production manager. Each Player receives a "Role Profile" describing his personal position on the various bargaining issues; and a "Team Profile" of his team's current position on each issue to be negotiated during the game.

Bargaining takes place over five issues: wages, union security, vacations, seniority, and contract length. For each of these issues there are six alternatives available with "Alternative No. 1," most favorable to the union and "Alternative No. 6," most favorable to the company.

The game, which can be completed in one day or played in shorter sessions on different days, requires a minimum of six hours to play. This includes time to review the game rules, three caucus sessions followed by three negotiating sessions, and a final debriefing session. When the present contract expires at the end of the last negotiating session, the teams' final positions on each issue are fed into the Agreement Result Calculator to determine one of twenty-one possible bargaining outcomes.

The calculating device is a series of paper wheels, each wheel reflecting both teams' positions on one of the five bargaining issues. The Agreement side of the device is used when the teams end the game agreeing on all five issues; otherwise, the "Non-Agreement" side is used to take into account the magnitude of the differences between the two teams on the various issues. The wheels are manipulated in the order of the priority of the issues, but in some cases, the final result is indicated before all of the wheels have been dialed. For example, an extreme position on wages, because it is a high priority issue with both teams, might determine the final outcome—a strike or company relocation--without regard to the other issues.

The range of the negotiations outcomes is illustrated by the following extremes:

> The difference in positions was resolved in subsequent bargaining and agreement was reached. The union membership ratified the contract and both sides consider the bargaining session as a fruitful and valuable experience.
>
> . . . . . .
>
> Although there are some issues on which agreement is close, union and management have not yet been able to agree on union security and wages. Bargaining is continuing but prospects for settlement look bad.

Although agreement is reached, concessions heavily weighted in favor of the union produce the result of the company closing down in six months. Concessions heavily weighted in favor of the company result in such dire outcomes as the membership refusing to ratify the contract, deciding to strike, and kicking out the union representatives.

Questions about these outcomes and the experiences of the game are discussed at the debriefing session. This session is important in accomplishing the game's purpose of identifying the steps in collective bargaining, the practical problems of a bargaining team working together, and what negotiators need to know to do a good job. Holgate Young, former CWA education director, who contracted Abt Associates, Inc., of Cambridge, Mass., to design the game said, "If military and businessmen can learn strategy and merchandising techniques from game situations, why can't union men learn something about bargaining?"

SUPERVISORY TRAINING PROGRAMS

Handling Conflict in Management

Handling Conflict in Management, issued by the American Management Association in 1969, is a series of three games directed at the basic management problem of conflict. Erwin Rausch (Didactic Systems, Inc.) and Wallace Wohlking (New York State School of Industrial and Labor Relations) designed the series to give managers and trainees an opportunity to improve their skills at resolving conflicts and to exchange ideas on how to turn potential conflict situations into productive channels.

Each game deals with a specific conflict situation and is packed with an administrator's guide and game books for five players:

Game I – conflict among peers
Game II – conflict between a manager and several subordinates
Game III – conflict between a manager and one subordinate

Most teams will finish a game in about two-and-a-half hours, and another half hour should be allowed for postgame discussion.

All players have the same role or assignment in the game, and each aims to perform better than the others in resolving potential conflict situations. They compare themselves within their group of five players which, in turn, forms a team whose performance can be compared with other teams. Participants are encouraged to discuss the defensive and other emotional reactions that arise in a conflict; how to recognize them, how to deal with them, and how to turn them toward constructive problem solving.

In Game I, each player is a factory supervisor who has just been told by the quality control manager that his department will have to rework the last order. The supervisor wants the quality manager to wait to impose the new, stricter standards on future lots, but he refuses, having already discussed it with the plant manager to whom both men report.

The game book offers seven alternatives for facing this conflict situation. Each supervisor enters his personal choice on the worksheet. Then he and his fellow supervisors discuss their choices and decide which alternative they consider best, and the group choice is entered on the worksheet. Next, they check the game book for the point values of the various alternatives along with the rationale for each, and individual and group scores are recorded.

As the team works through the case presented in the game book, their decisions involve:

- facing the conflict situation
- approaching the protagonist (quality control manager)
- recognizing emotional reactions

- opening communications
- de-escalating the conflict
- establishing an open-communications climate

A list of alternatives if offered each time, and both personal and group decisions are called for. In several instances, each supervisor is asked to compose his opening sentences; then, instead of points, each individual's score is based on the number of his colleagues voting his statement the best.

Group decisions can be by majority rule because there are time limits for the various sections of the game. Deadlocks, however, the designers point out, can be very useful in games dealing with conflict and if time is available, they suggest setting up even-numbered teams.

Game II involves potential conflict between a manager and his subordinate staff of supervisors. Each player is a proficient technical specialist recently promoted to manager; he has noticed that employees are taking coffee breaks considerably longer than they are entitled to, and he intends to bring up the matter at the supervisors' meeting. Decisions facing the team of player-managers involve:

- countering hostile reactions
- dealing with dissention
- planning strategies
- dealing with a polarized group
- resolving an impasse
- selecting a leadership pattern

Game III revolves around a situation of potential conflict between a manager and a subordinate manager. The player is the superior who has assigned the subordinate to convert an operation to a new process, and the first phase of the work is now two months overdue. Decisions facing the team of player-manager involve:

- taking the first steps
- achieving an early confrontation
- analyzing a subordinate's reaction
- dealing with defensiveness
- dealing with evasiveness
- dealing with withdrawal and preparing for disciplinary action
- dealing with a hostile response

The three "conflict" games have similar objectives and should not be used together in a continuous seminar. A minimum interval of two weeks is recommended.

The Supervisors' Workshop

The Supervisors' Workshop, a product of Human Development Institute, Inc., is designed to acquaint first-line supervisors with the problems likely to be encountered by first-time employees hired from the ranks of the hard-core unemployed. In 1968, the Labor Department awarded $600,000 to HDI, a Bell and Howell subsidiary, to demonstrate this kit and training program in 50 cities to affiliates of the National Alliance of Businessmen's JOBS program.

The unusual approach features a sensitivity kit which holds among other things:

one pair of glasses with prism lenses - one pink, one orange;

a small red ball;

a simple six-piece puzzle; and

two Halloween-type masks - one white, one black.

With the glasses on, participants find simple tasks difficult. Few can touch their left and right index fingers in front of them on the first try. Walking to the next table and shaking hands is an ungainly exercise; arms shoot out in reflex reactions, far from the mark. Throwing and catching a ball is even more difficult, and assembling the six irregularly shaped pieces of the cardboard puzzle into a rectangle is frustrating and slow.

Accompanying the gadgets is a workbook "for supervisors of the economically disadvantaged" and envelopes containing specific instructions for employee, supervisor, and observer during a role-playing experience. The emotional confrontation of role-playing is the most dramatic exercise in the S-Kit. To perform it, one supervisor wears the white mask; another, representing a black employee, wears the black mask; and a third acts as observer and grades his associates by answering questions from a checklist in the kit's workbook. As the drama unfolds, the black-masked supervisor is asked by his white-masked supervisor about misconduct on the job.

The idea is to create the kind of physiological and psychological disorientation that most new employees from disadvantaged backgrounds might encounter on the job. According to the Human Development Institute much of the kit concerns itself with placing the white supervisor in a situation where he can experience the black's bitterness, frustration, and anger—feelings that are often intensified when a black employee is thrust into a job situation.

Reference: "How to Succeed in Hard-Core Hiring," Business Week: August 24, 1968.

LIST OF REFERENCES

Labor Relations Games and Simulations

BNA's Collective Bargaining Game. (1959) Information available from John D. Stewart, President, Bureau of National Affairs, 1231 25th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20037.

Collective Bargaining (A Didactic Game) by Erwin Rausch. (1968) Published by Science Research Associates, Inc., Chicago; available from Didactic Systems, Inc., Box 500, Westbury, New York 11590.

Contract Negotiations (A Creative Studies Simulation) by Jay J. Zif & Robert E. Otlewski. (1970) Published by The Macmillan Company, 866 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10022.

CRISIS (Community Urban Hospital Administrative Training Simulation). (1971) Information available from Prof. William J. Wasmuth, New York State School of Industrial and Labor Relations, Cornell University, Ithaca, New York 14850.

DIRECTION (Simulation Training for Members of Board of Directors). (1971) Information available from Prof. William J. Wasmuth, New York State School of Industrial and Labor Relations, Cornell University, Ithaca, New York 14850.

Handling Conflict in Management: Games I, II, and III by Erwin Rausch & Wallace Wohlking. (1969) Issued by American Management Association; available from Didactic Systems, Inc., Box 500, Westbury, New York 11590.

IRC's Collective Bargaining Game. Information available from Richard A. Beaumont, President, Industrial Relations Counselors, Inc., Box 228, New York, N.Y. 10036.

The Personnel Department (A Creative Studies Simulation) by Jay J. Zif, Arthur H. Walker, & Eliezer Orbach. (1970) Published by The Macmillan Company, 866 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10022.

Reorganization (A Creative Studies Simulation) by Jay J. Zif, Arthur H. Walker, Eliezer Orbach, & Howard Schwartz. (1970) Published by The Macmillan Company, 866 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10022.

Settle or Strike (A Union-Management Collective Bargaining Simulation Exercise) by Abt Associates, Inc. (1967) Available from Communications Workers of America, Education Department, 1925 K Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20006.

The Supervisors' Workshop (A Workshop for Supervisors of the Economically Disadvantaged). (1968) Prepared by and available from Human Development Institute, Inc., 34 Old Ivy Road, N.E., Atlanta, Georgia 30305.

WORKSHOP (Training Simulation for Management of Rehabilitation Workshops). (1968) Information available from Prof. William J. Wasmuth, New York State School of Industrial and Labor Relations, Cornell University, Ithaca, New York 14850.

Catalogs and Games Lists

Game List. Abt Associates, Inc., 55 Wheeler St., Cambridge, Mass. 02138.

A Catalog of Ideas for Action Oriented Training. Didactic Systems Inc., Box 500, Westbury, New York 11590. 2nd edition, 1971. 53 pp. A listing of this organization's didactic games, seminars, and services, as well as simulations, games, books, and programmed instruction from other publishers.

Games and Simulations for Training Supervisors and Line Managers. Training Development Center, Sterling Institute, Two Pennsylvania Plaza, New York, N.Y. 10001. 1970. 4 pp. Lists 12 exercises, requiring 2 hours classroom time, available with materials for 16 participants and a cassette and workbook for instructor.

Robert G. Graham & Clifford F. Gray. Business Games Handbook. New York: American Management Association, 1969. 480 pp. Abstracts of 200 games in current use, introductory readings, and a bibliography.

Paul A. Twelker, ed. Instructional Simulation Systems; An Annotated Bibliography. Corvallis, Oregon: Continuing Education Publications, 1969. 286 pp. Includes both descriptive documents and game listings; subject index.

Background and Theory

Clark C. Abt. Serious Games. New York: Viking, 1970. 176 pp. The art and science of games that simulate life, for solving problems in a variety of social and institutional contexts.

Richard F. Barton. Primer on Simulation and Gaming. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1970. 239 pp. A handbook covering computer and noncomputer simulations and their applications in social sciences.

Sarane S. Boocock & E.O. Schild, eds. Simulation Games in Learning. Beverly Hills, Calif.: Sage Publications, 1968. 279 pp. Recent thinking and findings on games as teaching devices; intended for educational practitioners and behavioral scientists.

Elliot Carlson. Learning Through Games; A New Approach to Problem Solving. Washington, D.C.: Public Affairs Press, 1969. 183 pp. Covers a variety of gaming experiences including business and political games.

James S. Coleman, Sarane S. Boocock, & E.O. Schild, eds. "Simulation Games and Learning Behavior." American Behavioral Scientist: October 1966, pp. 1-32, and November 1966, pp. 1-35. Ten articles dealing with learning effects and strategies in simulation games.

Ray Glazier. How to Design Educational Games. Abt Associates, Inc., 55 Wheeler St., Cambridge, Mass. 02138. 2nd ed., 1970. 23 pp. A game design manual for teachers and curriculum developers.

John R. Raser. Simulation and Society: An Exploration of Scientific Gaming. Boston: Allyn & Bacon, 1969. 180 pp. Examines methodology and uses of simulation-gaming in the social sciences.

Business Game "Giants"

Kalman J. Cohen, William R. Dill, A.A. Kuehn, & P.R. Winters. The Carnegie Tech Management Game; An Experiment in Business Education. Homewood, Ill.: Irwin, 1964. 389 pp. A detailed review of the game and experiences with it.

James L. McKenney. Simulation Gaming for Management Development. Boston: Division of Research, Graduate School of Business Administration, Harvard Univeristy, 1967. 189 pp. An account of the development, status, and use of the Harvard Business School Management Game.

Hans B. Thorelli & Robert L. Graves. International Operations Simulation; With Comments on Design and Use of Management Games. New York: Free Press, 1964. 405 pp. Thorough examination of INTOP game developed at University of Chicago.

ERIC Clearinghouse
DEC 3 1971
on Adult Education

END

DEPT.OF HEALTH EDUCATION AND WELFARE

U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION

ERIC

DATE FILMED

2 24 72